



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

may occur before ι . Neither the author's nor any of the other attempts to formulate the precise conditions has proved satisfactory.

I am frequently at variance with the author's judgment regarding the significance for the dialect relations of this or that particular point of agreement, and I cannot wholly accept the principle (which he has also laid down elsewhere, as in his attack on the unity of Balto-Slavic) that only the innovations count and that even a whole series of points of agreement in conservation, such as are many, though not all, the characteristics common to the "occidental" or West-Greek group, is strictly without weight. But it would take too much space to discuss these matters here, in which, moreover, a certain degree of subjectivity is inevitable. No essential disagreement as to the classification of the dialects is involved.

Probably the majority of classical readers will be most appreciative of the second and third parts with the clear-cut descriptions of the literary dialects and the evolution and later history of the *κοινή*.

C. D. BUCK

M. Tulli Ciceronis de Divinatione Liber Primus. With a commentary by ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE. Parts I and II. "University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature." Vol. VI, Nos. 2 and 3. Published by the University of Illinois.

Professor Pease has done a great service to scholarship in providing what was hitherto lacking—an edition of the *De divinatione* that could take its place beside the adequate English and German editions of Cicero's other philosophical works. Students of ancient philosophy and religion, whether they accept all of Professor Pease's conclusions or not, may consult him with the confidence that they will not be put off with vagueness or evasion but will find all difficulties thoughtfully examined with abundant reference to the modern literature of the subject—German, French, English and, it is pleasant to add, American. The notes are mainly exegetical, text criticism being usually limited to explanations of the deviations from the Teubner edition of 1878 or readings unsupported by any of the MSS of the C group. The full notes emphasize chiefly the history of philosophic ideas, religion, religious antiquities, and, I regret to say, folklore. But they do not neglect questions of Latin usage or Ciceronian criticism and style. Especially interesting are the copious annotations of the fragments of Ciceronian and other early Latin verse.

The introduction presents a good account of the relation of the treatise to Cicero's other philosophical works, a sketch of its influence on subsequent literature, and a summary of German theories as to Cicero's sources in which Posidonius, of course, is prominent. Of this line of inquiry I can only say in Cicero's own words, "quis negat . . . disciplinam esse?"

Divinationem nego." I do not deny that Cicero copied late and second-hand authorities when it pleased him. My skepticism concerns the ability of modern scholars to divine that a given Platonic quotation must have been borrowed from Posidonius and was not taken directly from the Plato whom Cicero studied at school and preferred to all other philosophers and whom he knew more intimately than some of his critics seem to do who overlook his plainest references.

[In *De off.* i. 15 for example "formam . . . honesti vides: quae si oculis cerneretur mirabiles amores (ut ait Plato) excitaret sui." Wilamowitz (*Platon*, I, 346) misses the clear reference to *Phaedrus* 250 B and speculates wildly how "Hübsch" it is "wie Cicero sich hilft wo er aus Panai-tios einen Hinweis auf die Schau des Ewig-schönen im Symposion wieder-zugeben hat, *De officiis* i. 15, um die Idee Platons in seiner Sprache zu übersetzen."]

The relation to Plato may help to solve another problem that troubles Professor Pease; why, though an avowed academic, does Cicero say in the *De natura deorum* and repeat in the *De divinatione* that the Stoic view of the gods appeals to him more than the skeptical doctrine expounded by Cotta? Why because Cicero's skepticism like Plato's applies chiefly to absolute metaphysics. In practical religion and ethics the attitude of both is essentially Stoic though free from the pedantry of Stoicism. Chapter 72 of the second book of the *De divinatione* contains Cicero's real creed, which is the creed of all sensible—Platonists throughout history. His personal faith is a wistful and hopeful ethical deism. But he wished to preserve the institutional religion of his country, and he has not the slightest sympathy either with the excesses of popular superstition, on the one hand, or with the anti-religious propaganda of 'enlightenment' and rationalism, on the other.

It is not possible here to exhibit the wealth of material collected in Professor Pease's notes, still less to criticize them. Among the longer notes, sometimes developed into little monographs, may be mentioned astrology, pages 41 and 139; Dodona, page 45; Sibylline verses, page 50; *philosophorum*, 53; Socrates *omnesque Socratici*, 55, 56; Posidonius, 61; *sortium*, 72; *cornicem* 75; Aratus, 78; *acredula*, 83; *fissum in extis*, 94; Summanus, 98; alliteration, 102, which is now perhaps superseded by the portentous industry of Professor W. G. Evans' *Alliteratio Latina*; planets and comets, 103-5; fossils, 124; Roman examples in Cicero, 135; *ne respicerit*, 182; *devotio*, 185; taboos of beans and other foods, 203; infants fed by bees, 229; climate and national character, 234-35; the magnet, 247; earth, the womb and tomb of all, 330, where he might have consulted with profit Miss Beers's Chicago dissertation on *Euripides and Later Greek Philosophy*, page 42.

To touch on a few minor matters, on i. 6. 10 "si quidem ista sic recipiuntur ut et si divinatio sit di sint, et si di sint sit divinatio" Professor Pease comments "appropriate for such argument; cf. battledore and shuttle-

cock." Compare rather Plato, *Phaedo* 76 E. καὶ εἰ μὴ ταῦτα οὐδὲ τάδε with the context. Battledore and shuttlecock would more aptly illustrate stichomythia than this serious interdependence of arguments.

At xxiii. 46 "quod matris somnium immanis filii crudelitas comprobavit" I miss a note on the rhythm, which is conscious. Cicero is patterning his style here on the sentence which he praises in *Orator* 63 "patris dictum sapiens temeritas filii comprobavit." In i. 53 "singulari vir ingenio Aristoteles," what possible reason can there be for taking this as "characteristic of the encyclopedic Posidonius" rather than as Cicero's own opinion? In i. 51. 115 "animus . . . quia vixit ab omni aeternitate," etc. I fear that Professor Pease has again yielded to the Posidonius obsession. We know that Plato was acquainted with *Phaedrus* 247-49 and presumably with *Meno* 81 B. No more is needed. Again in 52. 118 "aut adfingit aut mutat aut detrahit" he has, if I may say so, been bluffed by Schmekel and the Posidonius legend into citing Stobaeus, *Ecl.* 117 διαίρεσιν . . . ἀλλοίωσιν . . . σύγχυσιν. If Cicero required authority he need not have looked farther than Lucretius ii. 769-70.

materies ubi permixta est illius et ordo
principiis mutatus et addita demptaque quaedam

which he of course knew.

These and other minor differences of opinion do not of course in the least impair the value of this excellent edition which is one of the most useful and learned pieces of work that any American scholar has to his credit.

PAUL SHOREY

Der junge Platon. By ERNST HORNEFFER. Part I. Sokrates und die Apologie. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1922.

Professor Horneffer believes that the most significant parts of a philosopher's life and writings are those that reveal the formation of his ideas and the shaping of his opinions. He proposes to undertake a fresh study of the youth of Plato from this point of view. The recent works of Pohlenz and von Arnim, and what he aptly characterizes as "Wilamowitz' Stimmungsentwicklung Platons," have, he thinks, not only not solved, they have not even stated the problem. His own solution is reserved for a later book. But to judge by the introduction to the present volume, his leading idea is that the religiosity of Plato and Socrates is a sincere resistance to the skeptical "enlightenment" of the Sophistic age and not merely the respectful acquiescence in traditional religion which is all that scholars who are themselves skeptics have seen in it.

This prepares the way for the main thesis of the book which is that the Delphic oracle which pronounced Socrates the wisest was genuine, was